



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

- ART. VII.—1. *The English Universities.* From the German of V. A. HUBER, Professor of Western Literature at Marburg. An abridged Translation, edited by FRANCIS W. NEWMAN, Professor of the Greek and Latin Classics at Manchester New College, and formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. London: William Pickering. 1843.
2. *Oxford University Commission. Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State, Discipline, Studies, and Revenues of the University and Colleges of Oxford, together with an Appendix.* London. 1852.
3. *Cambridge University Commission. Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State, Discipline, Studies, and Revenues of the University and Colleges of Cambridge, together with the Evidence and an Appendix.* London. 1852.

THE Englishman is always loyal to the past,—a true worshipper of antiquity, so far as it pertains to himself and his nation. His curiosity seldom transcends the limits of his own country, and there is little necessity that it should, for its history furnishes materials sufficiently abundant to occupy the attention of the most enthusiastic archæologist during the longest life. Every rood of its soil is rich in precious memories of by-gone years. Every ancient tree, every moss-clad rock, every mouldering ruin, if nature would give it voice, might rehearse tales of heroic suffering and noble daring, sufficient

“To stir a fever in the blood of age.”

An old British oak is beheld with interest, not merely because it is an ornamental and picturesque object of taste, affording shade and shelter to men and animals, and giving grace and beauty to a nobleman's grounds, but because it is associated with the early history of the nation. It is a child of the grove where the Druids worshipped. Those primeval forest-trees, in clustered beauty, stretched out their giant arms to form a magnificent natural temple, beneath which whole hecatombs of human victims were burned at a single holocaust. The same trees, wrought by human hands, and decorated by art, consti-

tute those clustered columns that sustain the lofty, flame-pointed arches of the Christian's sanctuary, which resound, not with the groans and wailings of dying victims, but with the melody of human voices and the solemn tones of the organ, going up in unison in praise of the living God. What a vast moral distance lies between these periods! Here the abominable and polluted orgies of heathenism are strongly contrasted with the pure and holy worship of the Christian Church; the Runic divineress with the Christian divine; the blood-stained robes of the Druid with the stainless vesture of the Christian presbyter. England's history embraces all that is great and glorious in modern civilization. The occasional discovery of Roman utensils, works of art, and ornaments, causes the mind of the scholar to revert at once to that period when the sagacious statesman sought to subdue the hardy Britons by Roman luxury and effeminacy, rather than by Roman arms. The result showed the wisdom of his policy. "Paullatimque discessum ad delinimenta vitiorum, porticus, et balnea, et convivorum elegantiam, idque apud imperitos humanitas vocabatur, cum pars servitutis esset." *

The brightest page, however, of purely British history belongs to the annals of Scotland. Her hardy Highlanders opposed an effectual check to Roman conquest, and prevented the fulfilment of the vainglorious boast, that the utmost limit of Caledonia should be reached by a continued series of victories. The Grampian Hills will be memorable down

"To the last syllable of recorded time."

Here Galgacus harangued his Caledonian braves. The words imputed to him by Tacitus still breathe and burn upon the page of history; and, by their matchless power and beauty, must continue to attract the attention of the scholar so long as eloquence has an admirer, or genius a worshipper. Who that has read, for the hundredth time, this eloquent speech, has not felt his blood pulsate with a livelier flow, and his cheek burn with indignation, at the historian's vivid description of Roman aggression? "Raptores orbis, postquam cuncta vastantibus defuere terræ, et mare scrutantur: si locuples hostis est, avari;

* Tacitus, *Agricola*, Ch. XXI.

si pauper, ambitiosi: quos non Oriens, non Occidens, satia-
verit. Soli omnium opes atque inopiam pari adfectu concu-
piscunt. Auferre, trucidare, rapere, falsis nominibus impe-
rium; atque, ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem adpellant.”*

But the Englishman’s warmest commendation, his most glowing eulogy, is reserved for the constitution of his country. Both Whig and Tory, conservative and radical, Churchman and Dissenter, agree in this, that it is the best form of government ever invented by man; containing the excellences of all others. It is no paltry parchment scroll which a citizen can read and understand in a few hours, but the accumulated wisdom of ages, embracing in its complicated structure the whole history of the nation, political, legal, and religious; for, like eternity, it has no chronology. It is true that reform has assailed its huge anatomy, and lopped off some portions which seemed essential to its existence; and revolution has broken its continuity with the past, wrenching asunder the line of hereditary regal succession. Yet the true conservative affirms that its essential beauty and integrity have never been marred,—that it is still the choicest legacy time has bequeathed to the world; the political Pharos of the nations; the bulwark at once of the king’s prerogative and the people’s liberty; the only hope of the groaning millions of Europe. Let him boast. He has more truth, perhaps, than we imagine. This intense nationality, this lofty patriotic pride, is happily illustrated by Bulwer, in his “England and the English”; and no man could do it better. He says:—

“The Englishman exults in the thought that so great a country belongs to himself. The root of all our notions, as of all our laws, is to be found in the sentiment of property. It is *my* wife whom you shall not insult; it is *my* house that you shall not enter; it is *my* country that you shall not traduce; and, by a species of ultra-mundane appropriation, it is *my* God whom you shall not blaspheme! In his own mind, the Englishman is the pivot of all things,—the centre of the solar system. Like Virtue herself, he

‘Stands as the sun,
And all that rolls around him
Drinks light and life and glory from his aspect.’”

* Tacitus, *Agricola*, Ch. XXX.

The Universities are part and parcel of this glorious constitution. They have long been regarded by the illiterate as storehouses of exhaustless wisdom, containing, perhaps, dark cloisters, where the infernal arts of magic are still practised. They are called by scholars "the two eyes" of the nation, not because they are the organs of vision to the people, but because they furnish to students "the light of all their seeing." They are very old, very proud, and, undoubtedly, full of wisdom. They have so long been independent of the Parliament, that they may well be called the fourth estate of the nation, an *imperium in imperio*. They have long legislated for themselves, and denied the right of royal visitation. For many years there have been rising up from the lower strata of society, where all reforms originate, loud complaints, that the Universities were behind the times,—that they were still teaching the obsolete sciences of the Dark Ages, and entirely overlooking those progressive sciences on which the material interests of the nation essentially depend. Educated men, more recently, have heard this sound of many voices, and have reiterated the charges. They finally reached the ear of royalty, and a "Board of Commissioners" was appointed to investigate the internal condition of the Universities. In 1844 Professor Lyell wrote as follows:—

"A royal commission, like those which have more than once visited of late the Universities of Scotland, might prove a sufficient counterpoise to the power and *vis inertiae* of forty learned corporations. They might suggest such remedies as the licensing of new Halls, the removal of tests on matriculation, the awarding of honorary distinctions for proficiency in the subjects of the professional lectures, and many others, which would doubtless be welcomed by the more enlightened members of the Convocation.

"Fortunately, no violent innovations are called for, no new endowments or grants of money. The commissioners would have to recommend the renovation of what has fallen into disuse,—the improvement of the old rather than the introduction of new and experimental systems. They would have to give force to existing academical statutes, now inoperative, rather than to enact new laws."

To this reasonable proposition, Professor Whewell, Head-Master of Trinity College, undoubtedly the first English scholar of the age, replied with some asperity. He says:—

“Such an interference from without with the legislation of the Universities would, I am fully persuaded, be productive of immense harm. It might destroy all the advantages of the existing system; but that anything so thrust into the structure of these ancient institutions would assimilate with their organization, or work to any good purpose, I see no reason to hope. Such a measure could hardly be attempted without producing a sentiment of wrong in the majority of the existing members of the University, which would deprive the new scheme of all co-operation on their part.”

In such a spirit the Commissioners were received. However, the *hauteur* of the college functionaries gradually gave way, and the desired information, in most instances, was freely communicated. The Commissioners were two years in session. Their Reports are before the public. They are full, minute, and specific. The very temple of the Muses has been uncovered, and now thousands of curious eyes are peering into the interior to gaze upon the hoarded rubbish which a thousand years had there accumulated. The rules and regulations ordained by the founders of the respective Colleges have been systematically violated, and practically annulled, and the oaths imposed by them upon the teachers have been taken with unlimited mental reservations, and received with the utmost latitude of interpretation. If the pious founders of these institutions could become cognizant of these facts, and once more be allowed to revisit the earth, they might with great propriety address the English Parliament in the memorable words of John Pym, uttered in the House of Commons, in the reign of Charles I. :—

“Since our royal lord hath in mercy visited us, let us not doubt but in his justice he will redeem his people. *Qui timide rogat, docet negare.* Where religion is innovated, our liberties violated, our fundamental laws abrogated, our modern laws already obsoleted, the property of our estates alienated,—nothing left us we can call our own but our misery and our patience,—if ever any nation might justifiably, we certainly may now most properly and most seasonably cry out, and cry aloud, *Vel sacra regnet justitia vel ruat cælum.*”

The colleges in their infancy were, undoubtedly, institutions of charity, designed expressly for the poor. William of Wykeham ordains that, next to his kinsmen, poor, indigent

clerks are to be admitted on his foundation, because Christ, among the works of mercy, hath commanded men to receive the poor into their houses, and mercifully to comfort the indigent. In Queen's College and New College, the Fellows are forbidden to keep dogs, on the ground, that to give to dogs the bread of the children of men is not fitting for the poor, especially for those who live on alms. Those to be elected are defined in the several colleges as "*pauperes*," "*magis pauperes*," "*pauperes ex eleemosyna viventes*," "*pauperes et indigentes*," "*sustentatione indigentes*," "*ex pauperioribus*." The sum assigned for their support was very small, not exceeding fifty shillings annually. John Balliol allowed the students on his foundation only one penny for daily food on weekdays and twopence on Sundays. Could the good man once more look upon the child of his early affections, and witness the sumptuous fare and gay attire of his beneficiaries, he might well exclaim,

"*Hei mihi, qualis erat ! quantum mutatus ab illo.*"

In the place of poor students, subsisting on coarse fare, and clad in mean attire, living in strict subjection to their teachers, and always within the cloisters of the college, he would find sleek Fellows, living at an annual expense of five hundred pounds, instead of fifty shillings, pursuing their own avocations and pleasures, a majority of them non-residents, employing themselves as parochial ministers, as schoolmasters or tutors, as students of law or medicine, as literary or scientific men, or having no employment at all. Instead of the meagre fare prescribed, he would find the college table spread with rich viands, not partaken of in silence, while some poor clerk read the Latin Bible, as the founder required, but enjoyed with the hilarity of a public festival. Instead of the coarse apparel and subdued deportment of young clerks, he would everywhere notice the flaunting robes, the jaunty, perhaps tipsy, air of young libertines. Instead of chants or prayers said or sung for the repose of the souls of the dead, he would find the daily prayers for the living attended only by constraint, and often disgracefully interrupted by the side-dialogues of undevout worshippers. These changes have been wrought in

part by time, in part by necessity, but most of them have been introduced to suit the convenience or pleasure of the Fellows.

Colleges are no longer eleemosynary. Though founded expressly for "the children of the poor," they have become the exclusive abodes of the children of the rich. Beneficed clergymen, men of official station, barristers in good practice, masters of large schools, and many of the sons of rich men, now receive emoluments from their foundations. These institutions rather resemble public hotels, thronged by gay and pleasure-loving visitors, than the quiet retreats of secluded students. The Muses have been supplanted by Venus and Bacchus. The prevailing vices of students are drunkenness, gambling, licentiousness, and extravagant expenditure. It is apparent from the Reports of the Commissioners, that students are permitted to contract debts *ad libitum*. Prepayment is the exception, and unlimited credit the rule. Money furnished by parents is squandered by students in sensual indulgence, and large debts are incurred for the necessities of life.

Young nobles and rich gentleman-commoners, of course, fix the standard of expenditures. The poor commoners hurry after them in the career of prodigality, *haud pari passu*. Birth and wealth receive peculiar honors in the Universities. Young noblemen wear a distinctive academical dress, take precedence of their academical superiors, and are permitted to receive degrees at an earlier period than other students. Great deference is paid to their rank by the officers of the Universities. Gentleman-commoners constitute another privileged class. Their wealth gives them this pre-eminence. Nothing could be more fatal to the interests of learning than such a factitious distinction. Wealth is always a hindrance to study. It is so in the case of gentleman-commoners. "This class may be regarded, taken collectively," says Professor Daubeny, "as the worst-educated portion of the undergraduates, and at the same time as the least inclined for study." This distinction, however, is sustained by public sentiment both in Church and State. Says Archbishop Whately:—

"I am not for abolishing the distinction between commoners and gentleman-commoners. If restrictions as to expense are laid down,

such as are suitable to men who can only afford from one hundred to two hundred pounds per annum, or even considerably less, it can hardly be expected that these will be conformed to by men of ten or twenty times that income. Why should a man not be allowed a valet, or a horse, who has been always used to such luxuries, and to whom they are not more extravagant luxuries than shoes and stockings are to his fellow-students?"

Equally good authority, probably, might be adduced in favor of horse-racing, fox-hunting, boat-racing, gambling, and of what Horace denominates the "*mala lustra*" of the suburbs; for all these are the favorite amusements of the gentry of England. In 1769, Junius charged the Duke of Grafton with taking his mistress to places of public resort and placing her at the head of his table. A friend of the Duke apologized for this gross indecorum by saying, "There is scarcely a gentleman in England but has been, at some time or other, seen at a public place with his female friend." Here a crime is supposed to be atoned for by its general prevalence, and a common participation in the guilt makes it honorable! Bristed, speaking of the morals of the English Universities, says:—

"The reading men are obliged to be tolerably temperate, but among the 'rowing' men, there is a great deal of absolute drunkenness at dinner and supper parties. The American graduate who has been accustomed to find even among irreligious men a tolerable standard of morality, and an ingenuous shame in relation to certain subjects, is utterly confounded at the amount of open profligacy going on all around him at an English university; a profligacy not confined to the 'rowing' set, but including many of the reading men, and not altogether sparing those in authority. There is a careless and undisguised way of talking about gross vice, which shows that public sentiment does not strongly condemn it; it is habitually talked of, and considered as a thing from which a man may abstain, through extraordinary frigidity of temperament, or high religious scruple, or merely as a bit of training with reference to physical consequences alone, but which is on the whole natural, and excusable, and perhaps to most men necessary."

Many of the men whose undergraduate course has been the most marked by drunkenness and debauchery appear after the "Poll" examination at divinity lectures, and step out of Barnwell into the Church, without the pretence of any other

change than in the attire of their outward man, the being "japanned," as the assuming the black dress and white cravat is called in university slang.

Young gentlemen, in a course of education, do but ape the vices of their seniors. The aristocracy of the Old World honestly believe in the hereditary right of licentiousness. They consider the lower classes as created for their convenience. Ladies of their own rank are regarded with the most scrupulous deference; women in humble stations are regarded as the instruments of their pleasure, and are treated precisely as Southern masters treat their female slaves. This is the common testimony of all who allude to the subject. Bulwer, in his "England and the English," observes: "Men rise by the prostitution of their dearest ties, and indifference to marriage becomes a means of the corruption of the state." Students bring with them to the Universities the vicious habits formed at home. So has it ever been. The colleges in the Middle Ages reflected the coarse and ferocious manners of their patrons. Violence and bloodshed were the common result.

"For nearly two centuries, our 'foster mother' of Oxford lived in a din of uninterrupted, furious warfare; nation against nation, school against school, faculty against faculty. Halls, and finally colleges, came forward as combatants; and the University, as a whole, against the town; or against the Bishop of Lincoln; or against the Archbishop of Canterbury. Nor was Cambridge much less pugnacious. Scarcely pope or king could interfere (in matters however needful) without unpleasant results. Every weapon was used. The tongue and pen were first employed: discussions before all kinds of judges, ordinary and extraordinary, far and near;—negotiation and intrigue, with all the powerful of the day: and when these failed, men did not shrink from the decision of violence."

Pinching poverty and hard fare were found to be the only sure preventives of such stormy outbreaks. "Scholars, like hawks," says Fuller, "fly best when sharp and not full gorged: and the monk's verse has much truth in it:

'Distentus venter
Non vult studere libenter.'

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, we have the following lively picture of the frugal habits of college students:—

“The greater part of the scholars get out of bed between four and five o’clock in the morning; from five to six they attend the reading of public prayers, and an exhortation from the Divine Word in their own chapels; they then either apply to separate study, or attend lectures in common until ten, when they betake themselves to dinner, at which four scholars are content with a small portion of beef bought for one penny, and a sop of pottage made of gravy of the meat, salt, and oaten flour. From the time of this moderate meal to five in the evening, they either learn or teach, and then go to their supper, which is scarcely more plentiful than the dinner. Afterwards problems are discussed or other studies pursued until nine or ten o’clock, and then about half an hour is spent in walking or running about (for they have no hearth or stove) in order to warm their feet before going to bed.”

Old Andrew Fuller, in his history of Cambridge University, also commends the frugal habits of the scholars in contrast with the luxury and sensuality of the monks. “What might be the reason,” he indignantly inquires, “that monks and friars in this age had such stately houses, rich endowments, plentiful maintenance, whilst students of the University had poor chambers, hard fare, short means, and that on their own parents’ charges, and yet there was more honesty, industry, painfulness, and piety within the study of one scholar than within the cells of a hundred monks?” But the sobriety of these poor students was rather the effect of poverty than morality. Each one might say, as did Micio, in the play,

“Hæc si neque ego, neque tu, fecimus,
Non sivit egestas facere nos,”

The history of the young aristocracy would tell a different tale. These high bloods were in constant broils with all classes around them. It generally requires all the time of young men of wealth to invent means of spending it. They have, therefore, little time for study.

In our own country, large fortunes are rarely acquired; and, owing to the equal distribution of property among all the children of a deceased parent, large estates seldom continue long in the same families. Excessive wealth is always an impediment to study. Where it does fall to the lot of a young scholar, it oftener injures than benefits the possessor. The best students are generally those whose limited means compel

them to practise economy, and whose success in life depends mainly on their own exertions. This class of students constitutes the majority in the Colleges of New England ; and their industry, sobriety, and correct deportment give to our literary institutions a higher moral tone than is found anywhere in the Universities of the Old World. Some tourists have been greatly captivated with student life in foreign lands, and are disposed to disparage our own Colleges in comparison. The following remarks from Brace's *Home Life in Germany* are of this description : —

“ Whatever our Colleges may have done, they have certainly, in one respect, proved a failure ; they have never succeeded in producing any genuine intellectual enthusiasm whatever, among the mass of the students. I never yet met a set of college-men in America who took any deep interest in their pursuits. The idea with most is, that college life is a kind of wearisome sea-voyage, — the great object lying beyond, — and that their first duty to the studies is to get rid of them. With some of the best minds, half of the most laborious efforts of the four years are spent in gulling tutors, and rushing through recitations on small capital. If the lesson is broken up, or the lecture put off, it is considered a victory. The teacher is the student's natural enemy in our Colleges. Those who do study work so mechanically for honors, or under some equally unworthy motive, that it is hard to imagine any high intellectual interest in the pursuit. The thing is the more remarkable, as, in all the intellectual pursuits of active life, we find in America the most absorbed enthusiasm and activity. But the moment we enter a college, even among men no younger than those without, it is all changed. The student's business is a bore, — a task, — a punishment ; and the sooner it is over the better. There are exceptions to these remarks ; but I am sure that in their general truth I shall have the agreement of the mass of college graduates throughout the country, whether they care to express it or not. The appearance of things in a German university is utterly different, and one sees at once that the common idea of their pursuits is quite another from that of our students at home. There is the deepest attention in the lectures. There is as much enthusiasm among them for an abstract theme, or a scientific subject they are investigating, as there is among the politicians or the business men without in their pursuits. This studying is their business, their profession, and they know it, and the mass of them would no more think of shirking lectures, than a botanist would of getting rid of his flowers, or a lawyer of his briefs. The feeling toward the teachers, too, is very different.

With less outward deference than with us, there is a far deeper love and reverence, — a feeling that there are great men among them, who are helping them on to higher stages of knowledge, and that any assistance from them is a kindness, and that their intercourse and instruction is a privilege to be received with gratitude. The great and prominent reason of this difference is, from beginning to end, a voluntary system. No student is obliged to attend lectures. No account is taken of presence or absence. No strict supervision is maintained over him with respect to his studies. The whole matter is left to his own sense of respectability, or his interest in the subjects taught. He is treated at once as a man, — as a reasonable and responsible man. And the effect is, with a few exceptions, what we might expect, — he acts like one. The idea is not in any way brought before his mind, that the studies are a task, — a burden placed on him by another. He can stay away or attend, as he chooses. The whole impression left is, that study is a privilege, an intellectual pleasure."

This is evidently a partial view both of our own and foreign Universities. Travellers commonly see but one side of an institution. They praise or condemn *en masse*. Bristed, in his flippant and conceited *exposé* of English university education, has everywhere taken occasion to treat his Alma Mater and his fellow-countrymen with profound contempt. Fortunately we can live without his good opinion. With regard to Americans, he is in precisely the predicament of poor Lee, the insane poet, who stoutly affirmed that all the world was mad, they as stoutly affirming that he was mad, and outvoting him. Some men seem to think it the best way of showing their independent and liberal spirit, to spurn the mother that bore them. While at home, they feel as if "caged in a kind of Noah's ark with a very few men and a great many beasts." When abroad, they roam over the Elysian fields, and meet none but heroes. From Mr. Brace's indiscriminate eulogy of German students, it is very evident that he had approached

" the shield
Of human nature from the golden side,
And would have fought even to the death to attest
The quality of the metal which he saw."

His statements will not bear the test of strict examination. He has evidently made no allowance for the difference of circumstances between the two classes of students. He does not

look at the object aimed at by the two systems of education. There is a wide difference between hearing and speaking ; between listening and reciting ; between receiving mental food from others, and providing it ourselves.

There are two prominent methods of imparting knowledge, differing widely from each other in character and results. In the one, the lecturer expounds to his audience the doctrines and principles of a science which have been demonstrated or assumed in speculation by himself or others. The hearers attend and listen, and, if they approve, treasure up his instructions. They are presumed to have capacity to receive the teacher's thoughts. Their minds have been developed by other discipline. In the lecture-room they are passive recipients. In the other method the learner is active. He not only receives, but produces thought. He is called upon to exhibit the results of his own labor. The former process is denominated *speculative* ; the latter, *practical*. The German student has already received his practical training at the gymnasium, before he enters the university. He is then prepared, by previous study, to appreciate and enjoy learned lectures. Neither the age, habits, nor attainments of American students would warrant the free system of the European universities, and it may be doubted whether such a system of instruction, under any circumstances, is desirable. Experience favors a union of the two methods. Some branches can be thoroughly taught only by recitations, others are best presented by lectures ; but when the speculative system has exclusively prevailed, it has usually led to a perfect chaos of opinions. The master spirit in the halls of learning has his brief day of triumph, and is succeeded by a new idol. Practical teaching lies at the foundation of all civilization, ancient and modern. In Greece, when the sophist took the chair of the *didaskalos*, learning declined, and system after system of wild speculation chased one another down to the abyss of oblivion, like shadows down the mountain's side. Cato, with a show of reason, feared the introduction of Greek speculations into Rome. He saw that philosophy was prostituted to the lovers of novelty, and that truth was sacrificed to effect. It is the great defect of the lecturing system, that it aims to move the passions as well

as to convince the understanding. The dress is of more importance than the man. The French historians and philosophers are lecturers. They are brilliant orators. They have recourse to point, antithesis, metaphor, and sometimes to exaggeration, to secure attention and applause. The Germans, too, deliver from their thrones, like sceptred tyrants in the realm of mind, system after system of philosophy to attentive audiences, who listen, admire, and commend, but do not perpetuate. Systems are toppled down, almost every lustrum, like the card-houses of children. Kant, in the language of German scholars, was destined to universal empire. He was dethroned by Fichte, a disciple who preferred to lead rather than to follow. Schelling played the part of Absalom with his predecessor, and stole from him the hearts of the people. Hegel thrust him through with a dart; and, in turn, fell before the logical battle-axe of the younger Fichte.

Where theories are constantly changing, like pictures in a showman's box, how can the inexperienced reasoner discern or reverence the truth? Says Professor Whewell, "He will probably think of his masters much as the poet speaks of the objects of his transient affection whom he chronicles:

'The gentle Henrietta then,
And a third Mary next did reign,
And Joan and Jane and Andria,
And then a pretty Thomasine,
And then another Katharine,
And then a long et cetera.'"

"The authority of the teacher," says Cicero, "is often a disadvantage to those who are willing to learn; as they refuse to use their own judgment, and rely implicitly on him they make choice of for a preceptor."* The Germans themselves are beginning to detect the eccentric orbits of these metaphysical comets, and to take their observations from the fixed stars. The historian Schlosser remarks, that "his judgments rest upon his views of human destination, and these, as well as those upon the nature and affections of man, he has formed and maintained for half a century, without allowing himself to be misled by all the systems of philosophy which have been de-

* De Natura Deorum, § 1.

veloped and propagated, since the time of Kant, all which he has carefully studied and examined." Huber, while he claims that "it is reserved for the masters of German philosophy really to hit the highest mark that can be proposed to the unassisted human mind," and treats with the utmost scorn the criticisms of the uninformed English scholars upon the "plodding Germans," nevertheless adds, with characteristic candor: "These summits are attainable to but very few; and there is room to fear that the stimulus which brought ripeness to the masters is gendering rottenness in the scholars, and is threatening to break up all positive, and thereby all living and life-giving knowledge. It seems to be aiming to resolve all religious, moral, political, and scientific cultivation into an utter negation of everything beyond self; and this the more effectually, the more confidently it pretends to replace or supersede them by greater unity." After eulogizing the success of the Germans in every domain of knowledge, he remarks: "At the same time, if our pompous sign-boards be pulled down, and the real facts behind be examined, sound human understanding will be found to have attained higher development, more force and versatility, in England than with us."

These sudden changes are not confined to metaphysics alone. Every department of human learning has its theorists and reformers. History is reconstructed and renovated. If Herodotus and Livy were to reappear on earth, they would not recognize themselves in their new German dress. Homer would find himself so multiplied, that the whole German pantheon could not give him room. For half a century, the Homeric question has occupied the attention of philologists and historians throughout the civilized world. Floods of ink have been shed over what Hartley Coleridge denominates "the Wolfish and Heinous theory," and now the public mind, after swinging like a pendulum, through half a circle, is returning to its former position. In theology Young Germany is so wrapped in fogs and clouds by erudite speculators, that it is very doubtful whether she sees the heaven and stars again for many days. In philology the entire field has long since been harvested, and gleaners have been following in the steps of the first reapers, and gathering up straws, for many years; and

where discovery fails, they resort to inventions. Every ancient author, like Tarpeia, has been buried in ornaments. The original text of the best classics bears about the same ratio to its commentary as the Koh-i-noor to Chimborazo. Huber, in one of his candid moods, exclaims:—

“I must declare my conviction and give my testimony, that all true and living results decrease in proportion as the means and the pretensions increase in number, artifice, and complication. In spite of all the lecture-lists of schools and universities with us,—in spite of all our ‘maturity’ regulations and examinations,—history, modern languages and their literature, the history of literature, and even natural history and geography, are studied less zealously, and less successfully, than in the corresponding academic spheres in England, where all is left to voluntary love of knowledge and self-incitement.”

Among their rich treasures the Germans have stored an immense amount of useless lore. One of their own critics, speaking of Voltaire’s Temple of Taste, says: “The wit of the poet shows us that those who write commentaries upon the ancients, the crowd of compilers and editors, the tasteless indicators and conjecturers, the searchers after things not worth searching for, are nothing wiser or more prudent in our days than they were in the seventeenth century.” The Germans are confessedly the most learned nation on the globe. Their scholars are more highly educated, but perhaps not better educated, than our own. Germany has done more for the education of the common mind than any people, and yet, says Professor Robinson, a very competent judge, “the Germans are not a reading, *thinking* people like the Americans. The population of our country, as a whole, is more enlightened than that of any nation under heaven.” Mr. Laing, in his Observations on Europe, says: “The Germans are the most superintended, the most interfered with, the most destitute of civil freedom and political rights, in a word, the most enslaved people of Western Europe, and the most educated.” Comparing American with European statesmen, and referring to our self-made men, and not particularly to scholars, he says: “In their foreign diplomacy, American ministers fresh from the counting-house, the printing-office, or the farm, conduct important negotiations, at least, as successfully as the regularly trained

ambassadors of the old European countries. American statesmen and generals have proved themselves equal to those bred in courts, and on *parades*, in *bureaux*, and at grand reviews." He elsewhere says : " A people of amateurs, artists, authors, performers in literature, music, painting, theatrical representations, and the fine arts, have not attained so true an education in the autocratic and semi-feudal states of the Continent, as the people of common sense and ordinary intellect have attained in the free social state of England and America."

Mr. Brace remarks, in the tone which pervades his book : " I never yet met a set of college-men, in America, who took any deep interest in their pursuits." Mr. Brace, it must be admitted, has been very unfortunately associated. The experience of other graduates differs, *toto cælo*, from his. The great majority of American students are earnest, industrious, and faithful in the discharge of their appropriate duties. They are as enthusiastic as German students would be under like circumstances. They may not, indeed, show, in their long-continued and severe application to study, and in the critical and searching examination of their acquisitions in the recitation-room, the same zeal and animation which they would exhibit in attending a course of popular lectures. It is one thing to partake of a rich entertainment provided at another's expense, and quite a different thing to be one's own purveyor, providing for the feast at the expense of great personal toil. Every hour of the time of an American student is occupied. He cannot be idle or absent himself from his prescribed duties without losing his standing. Every occasional absence from chapel and recitations is noted by monitors, and, in some colleges, twenty such marks will secure his dismissal. By such discipline, habits of exactness, punctuality, and perseverance are formed, which accompany the student through life.

In the English Universities, the undergraduates are required to attend sometimes two lectures every day, in some instances only one. These duties are performed between the hours of nine and two. But most of the instruction is given by private tutors. This method of instruction is considered very objectionable, both by the Commissioners and by most of the Heads of Colleges, still it is tolerated of necessity. It is a parasiti-

cal system, which has grown up gradually and eaten the very heart and life out of the old system of instruction. When a young man enters the university, he selects as his tutor a young graduate, very nearly of his own age, to whom he pays fourteen pounds per term for private lessons. The sum thus expended annually at Cambridge is computed to amount to £ 50,000. The following remarks of Professor Lowe accurately describe the course pursued :—

“ The system of private tuition has many defects. The persons into whose hands it principally falls are young men of unformed character, knowing little of the world, or probably of anything except the course of study by which they have gained distinction. They have, nevertheless, very great influence over their pupils, and are, from their youth, their sincerity, and their earnestness, the most dangerous missionaries of whatever opinions they take up. They are the persons who are really forming the minds of the undergraduates, before they have formed their own. The University knows nothing of them, except their names in the Class List ; in their Colleges they have no *status*, and it is quite optional with them whether they enter into the society there or no. Everything is intrusted to them, and no caution whatever is taken for the execution of the trust. As regards the private tutors themselves, I cannot but think it bad for them that the moment they have taken their degree they should be considered as at once elevated to the highest intellectual eminence, and spend their whole time in teaching that which they have but just and barely learnt. The tendency to narrow the mind and generate habits of self-conceit is obvious. It also stands seriously in the way of their acquiring much useful knowledge ; though I think this in some degree compensated by the ardent desire to learn, which the habit of teaching is almost sure to produce. Young men are often at this time pressed by college debts, or otherwise in narrow circumstances, and the temptation is irresistible to labor to any extent so as to avoid these embarrassments. I have myself taken ten successive pupils in ten successive hours, term after term,—a task neither fitting for the tutor nor just to the pupil.”

This process of imparting knowledge is technically called “cramming.” It resembles the method which Italian cooks adopt, to prepare certain birds for the table of the epicure. There is a species of bird in Italy, considered a great delicacy when highly fattened, which takes its food only at the rising of the sun. They are caught and confined in dark rooms, into

which a bright light is poured once in two hours. The bird, seeing the light and thinking it the coming of a new day, eats greedily of its favorite food, and is thus, in a short time, fitted for the palate of the *gourmand*. So the student is "*crammed*" for the coming examination. College honors, prizes, and fellowships determine the choice of studies, and the degree and amount of attention devoted to them. But a small portion of the undergraduates become competitors for the honors. These are hard students, and are, in fact, almost the only reading students in the university. Those who aim at nothing higher than an ordinary degree give little attention either to the required or to voluntary studies. The authors in which they are examined are few. The Oxford Commissioners remark :—

"We have said that the number of candidates rejected in examination for an ordinary degree is considerable, but, notwithstanding this, the amount of attainments commonly exhibited in these examinations is small. An ordinary candidate has prepared usually four plays of Euripides, four or five books of Herodotus, with the history, six books of Livy, also with the history, half of Horace, four books of Euclid, or, in lieu of Euclid, Aldrich's Compendium of Logic to the end of the reduction of syllogisms. He is also expected to translate a passage from English into Latin, and to construe any passage of the four Gospels; to repeat and illustrate from Scripture the Thirty-nine Articles, and to answer questions on the historical facts of the Old and New Testament. The examiners are satisfied with a very slight exhibition of knowledge as regards many of these subjects. If decent Latin writing should be insisted on, the number of failures would be more than quadrupled. The Latin and Greek authors are commonly got up by the aid of translations. The knowledge of logic is very meagre."

Few American students would shrink from such an examination.

Again, Mr. Brace says of our American Colleges: "If the lesson is broken up, or the lecture put off, it is considered a victory." It is undoubtedly true that any class of persons, who are severely tasked every day, will desire occasional relief. Laborers always greet a holiday with joy. So do students; but let any tutor allow his class to take a vacation when they please, or suspend his exercises for a single week, and every one of his pupils will be ready to petition the faculty for con-

stant and competent instruction. No patrons are more exacting upon public servants than students, and none are less inclined to be content with short commons, either for the mind or the body.

Again, Mr. Brace affirms, without qualification: "The teacher is the student's natural enemy, in our Colleges." There is a shade of truth in this assertion. The same may be said of the master who exacts the service due from his apprentice, or of the parent who requires obedience and labor from his son. The righteous enforcement of law always causes a certain portion of its subjects to reluctantly. Strict devotion to duty is not characteristic of all men. Whatever may be the case in Europe, it is found by experience, in this country, that little can be accomplished without the authority of law. The free system will not answer. The duties must be prescribed and enforced by competent authority. Where the task is rigidly exacted, the teacher in some sense becomes the antagonist of the pupil. "He that wrestles with us," says Burke, "strengthens our nerves and sharpens our skill. Our antagonist is our helper. This amiable conflict with difficulty obliges us to an intimate acquaintance with our object, and compels us to consider it in all its relations. It will not suffer us to be superficial.

'Pater ipse colendi
Haud facilem esse viam voluit.'

This kind of opposition exists between teacher and pupil in all lands; and it will not be denied, that, with a small fraction of American students, to wit, the idle and immoral, it amounts to enmity. But more of this hereafter. Severe and protracted toil either of mind or body is, at first, always irksome; and, with the undisciplined, is apt to produce discontent.

"Whilst mental effort," says Sir William Hamilton, "is the one condition of all mental improvement, yet this effort is at first, and for a time, painful, as it abstracts from other and positively pleasurable activities. It is painful, because its energy is imperfect, difficult, and forced. But as the effort is gradually perfected, gradually facilitated, it becomes gradually pleasing; and when finally perfected, that is, when the power is fully developed, and the effort, changed into spontaneity, becomes an exertion absolutely easy, it remains purely, intensely, and alone insa-

tiably pleasurable. For pleasure is nothing but the concomitant and reflex of the unforced and unimpeded energy of a natural faculty or acquired habit, the degree and permanence of pleasure being also in proportion to the intensity and purity of the mental energy. The great postulate in education is, therefore, to induce the pupil to enter and persevere in such a course of effort, good in its results and delectable, but primarily and in itself irksome."

All young men who mean to be educated must, at some time in their lives, overcome this natural aversion to study, must submit to the drudgery of patient thought, and thus acquire a habit of fixing the attention. When this result is once obtained, the pleasure of intellectual acquisition will amply reward the previous toil. "The roots of learning," said Aristotle, "are bitter, its fruit sweet." The teacher therefore must, from time to time, present to his toiling class some of the clusters of Eschol to induce them "to go forward" and possess the promised land,—a land which will emphatically "flow with milk and honey."

The union of the two methods of teaching, by lectures and recitations, has been found to be eminently useful in forming sound thinkers and able reasoners, both in England and America.

"The critical system (i. e. the German) seems to me to be properly addressed, not to students who are undergoing education, but to philosophers who have been completely educated. Nor can I believe, that to put young men in such a position, at a period of their lives when they ought to be quietly forming their minds for future action, can have any other result than to fill them with a shallow conceit of their own importance; to accustom them to deliver superficial and hasty judgments; and to lead them to take up new systems with no due appreciation of the knowledge, thought, and gravity of mind which are requisite for such a purpose."*

The adoption of the voluntary system, in America, would lead to anarchy. The students are not sufficiently advanced to choose their own studies; for to know the value of any kind of intellectual discipline, a man must have felt its influence and stimulus on his own mind. Neither are parents or guardians

* Professor Whewell.

competent to choose for their sons or wards; for in a majority of cases they are not men of liberal culture. If our young students were entirely exempt from tutorial supervision, and only invited to listen to eloquent lectures, instead of being required to prepare recitations, they would probably love their teachers more, and study less. They would be on very good terms with the learned living, but on very ill terms with the learned dead,—

“Those sceptred sovereigns who still rule
Our spirits from their urns.”

“The German student,” says Mr. Brace, “is treated, at once, as a man,—as a reasonable and responsible man. And the effect is, with few exceptions, what we might expect,—he acts like one.” Let us hear other witnesses. Mr. Henry E. Dwight, who visited Germany some years ago, says :—

“The German students feel, as soon as they have entered on their career, as if all those restraints were removed by which they were curbed while in the *Gymnasias*, and they enter on their wild and stormy course of life, resolving to submit to no laws except such as the *Landsmanschaften* or clans of the University impose upon them, and those which are enforced by the strong arm of the laws.”

Mr. Dwight represents the German students as *outré* in their dress and offensive in their manners, smoking, drinking, and fighting daily. Their secret societies are often hostile and dangerous to the government. They are leaders in riots, mobs, and more recently in revolutions. They send challenges for the slightest offences, and often two or three hundred duels are fought in a single term at one University. Students who fight are horribly hacked and mutilated by their long swords. Both eyes are sometimes put out; and often the nose is cut off, which must necessarily injure the personal appearance of those manly worshippers of Mars. The thirst for acquiring distinction by fighting, and by getting into rows with the police, with the Philistines, and with one another, attracts many young men to these Universities, for no other object than to pass their time as pleasantly as possible, with the intention of leaving behind them the brilliant reputation of a genuine *Bursch*.

Mr. Laing, an intelligent and educated traveller, whose opinions are entitled to great credit, on account of his candor and impartiality, introduces his chapter on German students as follows:—

“We hear and read so much about the students at the German Universities, the Burschenschaft, as a distinct and formidable political body,—so much about their dress, habits, and student life,—about their drinking, swaggering, duelling, extravagance in low debauchery, and exultation in their extravagance,—so much too about their clubs, secret associations, and opinions dangerous to the state, which the German sovereigns endeavor in vain to discover and suppress, that the traveller in Germany makes it one of the last subjects of his inquiries,—What is this body, this Burschenschaft? If not the interests of science, the much higher objects, the peace, order, and well-being of society, require the abolition of the present system of German Universities, by which the youth, the public functionaries, the whole legislation and administrative machinery of the state, and education of the people, and the public opinion itself, are trained and moulded into theoretical and exaggerated views of the real affairs of life, by a *clique* of visionary professors, who have in reality the formation of the mind of every human being susceptible of education, from the child’s at day-school to the statesman’s in the cabinet of the sovereign, entirely in their hands.”

Mr. Laing prefers, decidedly, the English method of training, and condemns, in no measured terms, the lecturing system, both in Germany and Scotland. These authors leave us no room to doubt that the manners and morals of the Dark Ages have been perpetuated among students, in Europe. In the early history of Cambridge, a class of bullies was found corresponding to the “Burschen” of Mr. Dwight, whose element was the storm, whom Fuller very properly calls “rake-hells.” Huber, comparing the morals of the English and German Universities, says:—

“At the German Universities, folly showed itself in the more evident form of a gay fool’s dress,—it was boyish, silly, sentimental, noisy, or adventurous, and swaggered about in rapier and spurs. It degenerated more easily into the coarsest vulgarity; it got drunk on brandy and beer. . . . The secret or open societies, bound together either by clanships, natural ties, or other leagues, seriously pursuing some crazy political schemes; above all, ‘the point of honor,’ the duelling, the code of laws to which this very point of honor served as a guaranty,—were characteristic of German University life and its follies.”

After charging the English Tories with "disgusting hypocrisy and cant," in attempting to conceal or varnish over the gambling, drunkenness, and licentiousness of their University students, Huber concludes that the English are more decent, but not less wicked, than the German scholars.

"Rank immorality prevails without, while a scholastic or semi-monastic decorum prevails within the walls of the Colleges. The English student, as soon as he has passed the college threshold, or the bounds of the University, seeks and finds every opportunity for diversion and debauchery, which the state and age of the nation offer to young or old mad-caps. They commit the oldest sins in the newest kind of ways."

American Colleges have never been characterized by such open profligacy and scandalous crimes. Still they have their vices, both inherited and acquired. In every college, there is a small minority of students who hate study and love mischief; who sacrifice to the Muses in public, and worship Bacchus in private. Such young men, possessing violent passions and vicious appetites, frequently overawe the majority who are well-disposed, and, for a time, give tone to the public morals of a college. Such youth often conceal their misdeeds by threatening to be revenged on any who may accuse them. Criminals are usually reckless and dangerous, and many a villain has escaped "unwhipt of justice," because no citizen could be found bold enough to invoke the aid of the law. An informer is always odious. The government spies of Greece and Rome, the *Συκοφάνται* and *delatores*, who dogged the steps of citizens only to ensnare them, have, to some extent, transmitted their own infamy to the legal and righteous prosecutors of admitted criminals. Informers anciently had a personal interest in the accusations which they brought, receiving a portion of the fine awarded. In Rome they were called *quadruptatores*, because they received a fourth part of the fine paid by the person against whom they informed. In college, no distinction is made between an informer and a witness. So strong is the reluctance of students to expose the crimes of an associate, that young men, whose characters are otherwise unimpeached and unimpeachable, will resort to shifts, evasions, equivocations, and even falsehoods, to screen the guilty. This "principle of honor" (as it is called), in civil suits, has sometimes led to perjury.

The grounds of this false standard of morals are twofold. First, there is a prevailing notion in the community at large, that young men, in the process of education, are a privileged class; that they may with impunity enact follies at school which would subject them to a legal prosecution at home; that they must "sow their wild oats" in college, though they should afterwards reap a bitter harvest of sorrow in active life. Secondly, every association, for whatever purpose formed, creates for itself a local public sentiment. The united opinion of their fraternity, their clique or set, can alone justify or condemn their conduct. Sustained by numbers, they are strong. Shielded by their associates, culprits escape merited punishment. This is eminently true of scholastic life. The best students think that they have done all their duty, if they violate no law themselves. They do not feel, as every good citizen ought to feel, that they have an interest in the prevention of crime, or the detection of it when perpetrated. This is the business of the faculty. They are responsible for the correct deportment of every student, though his vices are concealed by the darkness of midnight, and the deeper darkness of falsehood on the part of those who ought to testify. No college faculty in the country expects voluntary information from students. The character of a gossip, an eavesdropper, and a tattler is everywhere and at all times detestable; but when a person is called before a competent tribunal, one that has a legal and moral right to question him, if he refuses to give evidence, or misrepresents facts to conceal the transgressor, he commits a grievous wrong. He violates law both human and divine. He defiles his conscience with a lie, and stains his soul with deep and damning guilt. According to our criminal law, if a citizen conceals a capital crime, though not summoned to testify before a court, he is guilty of "misprision of felony," one of the highest offences known to our courts. The same guilt, in kind, if not in degree, is incurred by the student who wilfully prevaricates or falsifies, when questioned by his teachers. He has no right to conceal the truth, in order to screen a criminal. He is just as much bound to speak "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," when solemnly appealed to by the authorities of his college, as though he were testifying,

in open court, under oath. The moral law follows every man from the cradle to the grave. It is never suspended or modified. God does not cease to exist, though men attempt to hide from him. "There is no darkness nor shadow of death where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves."

The student's station in life, so far from diminishing his responsibility, actually *enhances* it. He is a favored child. He has been selected from his equals in rank on account of some fancied or real superiority in intellect or morals. He has, perhaps, been elevated to his present position by the toil and sacrifice of his parents, or the charities of kind friends. Being thus favored, he is bound to be more circumspect than others who have enjoyed fewer advantages. He will be judged by the light he enjoys. A falsehood in him is more heinous than in an unlettered rustic; and God will so judge him, whatever rules of conduct his associates may establish to the contrary. Heaven's doors will be for ever closed to "whatsoever loveth or maketh a lie"; and "he that knew his Master's will, and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes." It is a monstrous perversion of "honor" to make it the shield of vice. It is true we hear of "honor among thieves," and Milton says,

"Devil with devil damned
Firm concord hold";

but a college is not ordinarily a den of thieves or a pandemonium.

Class honor is always partial and exclusive. It has respect only to class dignity and reputation, never regarding the welfare or reputation of the college. Classes, however, are always right. Parties are always right in their own esteem. The votes of the majority show it. Classes in secret conclave, like kings, can do no wrong. If their measures are opposed, they resort to their natural rights, and make a declaration of independence. Class rebellions usually grow out of the punishment of some member of the class. He may be notoriously guilty; still, as the faculty acted in view only of circumstantial evidence, their verdict is pronounced unjust. Kindred spirits declaim loudly against the sentence, denouncing the faculty as a set of bigoted inquisitors refusing to confront

the accused with his accusers, and condemning the innocent without proof. A petition for pardon is prepared. Well-disposed students sign it precisely as citizens often petition for the pardon of a convict, from fear of the vengeance of the culprit, if he is ever released. A letter of condolence, too, must be written to the parents of the morally diseased student. So the plot thickens, till reason resumes her sway and the rebels return to duty.

It is not probable that a college rebellion ever occurred which could be justified *in foro conscientiae* of the actors, or before a judicial tribunal. The laws of our Colleges are administered with great prudence and lenity. Severity of punishment is never resorted to except in cases of great and undoubted criminality. Follies are always distinguished from crimes, and are treated accordingly. Young men who cannot keep the peace and submit to the wholesome regulations of a New England college, must be fit candidates for an insane asylum or the penitentiary. Cicero gives us the right notion of "honor," when he affirms, "*Honestum*, or honorable, ingenuous, commendable principle, is that which challenges our esteem and best affections upon the merit of its own intrinsic worth and excellence, exclusively of any profit or compensation." Again he adds: "Whatever upon the score of its own excellency and rectitude becomes the subject of praise, lays no claim to the word *honestum* [honorable] by virtue of any certificate from a multitude, but because, although no mortal had known anything of it, or spoken anything concerning it, in its own nature it would be lovely and laudable." If the public sentiment in Christian lands were elevated to this standard, our Colleges would soon be purged of rowdies, liars, and rebels. We should hear no more of

"The stout, tall captain, whose superior size
The minor heroes view with envious eyes;
Who is their pattern, and on whom they fix
Their whole attention while they ape his tricks.
His pride, that scorns t' obey or to submit,
With them is courage; his effrontery, wit.
His wild excursions, window-breaking feats,
Robbery of gardens, quarrels in the streets,
His hair-breadth 'scapes, and all his daring schemes,
Transport them and are made their favorite themes."

This picture of college life, though belonging to a former century, has not become obsolete. It is still true to nature. The worst feature in academic life in America is its rowdyism. In every college and academy may be found a few young men, "fellows of the baser sort," whose habitual deportment would afford presumptive evidence of the truth of Lord Monboddo's theory of the origin of our race. They have most of the characteristics of the *simia* tribe, except the caudal appendage. Like monkeys, they delight in mischievous tricks, in the wanton destruction of property, and in the disturbance of the public peace. They never exhibit any elevated aims or pursue any object worthy the attention of a rational being. Like the buffoon of the satirist, they turn night into day :

"Noctes vigilabat ad ipsum
Mane ; diem totum stertebat."

They invent mischief over their cups, and execute it in the delirium of intoxication. They make night hideous with their howlings, but, like kindred prowlers, "when the sun ariseth, they gather themselves together and lay them down in their dens." Such rioters, by their ceaseless activity, seem to multiply themselves, as a few actors, by skulking behind the scenes and often reappearing upon the stage, manage to represent an army. By their disguises (for they are generally disguised) they increase their native deformity both of mind and body. Assuming the livery of their master, like him they "go about seeking what they may devour," whether it be a turkey, a chicken, or an ear of corn. Such students are always ingenious in planning, and efficient in executing, new kinds of mischief. Says Professor Newman: "By far the worst uproar which took place at Oxford during my personal acquaintance with it was occasioned by the (then) Dean of Christ Church forbidding his undergraduates to hunt in *red coats*. A night or two afterwards, they daubed over with red paint all the doors of the dean and canons; and when inquiry into this was instituted, they the next night wrenched the doors off their hinges, and made a fire of them in the quadrangle." Now admitting the requisition to be unnecessary, what a state of feeling in young men "under tutors and governors" does this

wanton outrage exhibit! But such acts of lawless violence too often disgrace communities of young men who form their own rules of honor, and dishonor themselves in the observance of them.

Besides those sporadic cases of disorder above alluded to, our American Colleges are afflicted with certain moral epidemics, which periodically or annually pervert the sentiments of whole classes. Such is the systematic abuse of Freshmen by Sophomores. Since the system of "fagging" has gone into desuetude, the stranger is subjected to petty annoyances by his enlightened superiors. This custom springs in part from vanity and in part from jealousy. Those who occupy an elevated position are apt to spurn those who are climbing to the same height. So a *novus homo* in ancient Rome was always regarded with dislike and suspicion by the hereditary aristocracy.

" There 's no philosopher but sees
That rage and fear are one disease ;
Though that may burn and this may freeze,
They 're both alike the ague."

It might seem that the Sophomore, who has been himself a stranger and been "evil entreated" by the college "Philistines," would remember his hard bondage, and show pity to those who are in like circumstances; especially while the vestiges of his primitive verdure still linger about him, and his inward thought still is, "Green becomes my complexion best."

If such follies as we have cited could be abolished, our Colleges would stand incontestably higher than the European Universities, both in morals and in devotion to study. The gross vices of the Old World have not yet taken root among us. However, it is a common impression that students, everywhere, have a low standard of morality. A college is regarded as a species of intellectual hospital, where all are under treatment for mental maladies, both connate and acquired; and every new-comer who enters its walls is thought to be exposed to a deadly moral contagion. Careful parents are apt to look with suspicion upon all schools, and to inquire anxiously as to the deportment and character of those pupils with whom their children must associate. For this reason, in

many of our large towns and cities, "the best families" withhold their patronage from free schools, because they fear that their children will be contaminated by the vulgar dialect and vicious conduct of many who attend them. This opinion, both with reference to common schools and universities, is highly erroneous, and ought to be corrected. Schools have their vices, and so have the communities in which they exist; and the schools generally reflect, with great accuracy, the manners, habits, and opinions of their patrons. The stream can never rise above its fountain. If the domestic circle be polluted with profane and indecent conversation, the children of such a home will carry the moral plague with them to the school. In a majority of cases the pupil brings his vices to the place of study. The seeds are sown at home; the influence of kindred spirits develops them. So it was in the days of Quintilian. This virtuous Roman, of the old *régime*, complains bitterly of the social habits of his age. "Utinam liberorum mores non ipsi perderemus. Infantiam statim deliciis solvimus. Mollis illa educatio, quam indulgentiam vocamus, nervos omnes et mentis et corporis frangit." After enumerating the prevailing faults of domestic education, he adds: "Fit ex his consuetudo, deinde natura. Discunt hæc miseri ante quam sciant vitia esse; inde soluti et fluentes non accipiunt e scholis mala ista, sed in scholas afferunt." This accords with the experience of teachers in all ages. Parents train their children to habits of idleness, intemperance, and prodigality, and then charge upon the institution where these traits are exhibited the ruin of their sons. Parents seldom judge accurately of the attainments or morals of their children. The vicious youth has the cunning to conceal his illicit indulgence. He is ingenious in excuses and successful in deceiving the partial eye of his father.

Most teachers fear the advent of a *perfect boy*. Many a lad has entered an academy or college of whom his fond father said, "If my son has a fault, I do not know it," who yet before the close of his first day's probation, by a species of elective affinity, has been on intimate terms with the most profligate students in the seminary. Rogues know one another by intuition. So do idle and mischievous young men. Bring to-

gether a thousand youths, all strangers to each other, in one institution, and not a day will elapse before you will find those very persons herding together whom you as their guardian especially wish to keep remote from one another. The timid, the modest, and the serious will shrink from the public gaze, and will be slow to form acquaintance with others. The excitable, the vicious, and the prodigal will rush into one another's embrace, renew their former objectionable practices, and commence a career of folly such as accords with the secret promptings of their nature. A well-trained, well-balanced mind does not suddenly desert the path of rectitude.

"Nemo repente fuit turpissimus,"

says Juvenal. Every moralist since his day admits the assertion. Where there is a congenial soil, the seeds of vice will spring up and bear their bitter harvest, which is

"Like Dead Sea fruits,
That tempt the eye, but turn to ashes on the lips."

The young man who becomes corrupted in a college would be very likely to meet the same fate in any other station of life. If there is a predisposition to physical or moral maladies in the constitution, the contagion will find its victim. Though he be secluded in a desert, the pestilence will fly on the wings of the wind to meet him.

Hereditary tendencies, it is true, are developed by involuntary sympathy. Society stimulates the passions and appetites of the young, so that the latent propensities are more speedily disclosed at school than at home. But when the train has already been laid to the magazine of mischief by parental indulgence, the explosion will soon follow. When gentlemen allow their children to sip wine at their own tables, and to join in the game of whist in their own parlors, they must not complain if their sons waste their hours of study in games of chance, or are sometimes brought from a secret merry-making overcome by strong drink. Card-playing and convivial entertainments are strictly forbidden by the laws of our American Colleges, and with good reason; for such diversions are a very Pandora's box, where no hope lingers at the bottom. Still we doubt if there is a college officer of two

years' standing, that has not received from some inveterate offender, who has wasted his time and estate upon such amusements, this plea: "My father permits me to enjoy these recreations. He allows me to drink wine, and to join in games of chance at his own fireside." When habits of idleness and intemperance have been formed at home, it is preposterous to expect them to be reformed in society. Young gentlemen who have concealed their vices even from the watchful eye of maternal solicitude are offered at college as "model students," faultless in deportment, and successful in study. A few weeks or terms put an end to their probation, and the honest youths are as much surprised as their parents at their own need of rustication. Then a storm of indignation bursts upon their teachers, who are expected to sweeten an addled egg with Attic salt. Poor "harmless drudges"! They ought to have spoken to the young prodigal earlier in his course. They ought to have exercised greater watchfulness over the unsteady steps of the innocent adventurer; so young and inexperienced! They should have written to his parents, who could at once have corrected his faults. He was never known to disobey their commands or go counter to their wishes.

The Oxford Commissioners remark, "If a tutor ventures to communicate to a parent any suspicion of his son's society, expenses, or habits, he is pretty sure to be told that the parent has questioned his son, and feels perfectly confident in his explanation." A father can seldom see the justice of his son's punishment. He believes the boy, and blames the "prejudiced" judges. It is a rare occurrence for parents to approve of the execution of wholesome laws upon their children. Their sons are *peculiar*; they are *misunderstood*; they are *unjustly charged*; they are *martyrs to expediency*. Thus they confirm their vicious habits, and render their reformation almost hopeless. The pulsations of college life beat in unison with those of the domestic circle. The student easily satisfies his father with excuses, but he cannot so easily pervert the ear of justice. Says Terence:

"Pro peccato magno paululum supplicii satis est patri."

This maxim has an unwonted significancy where the old and

young practise the same vices and follies. Let the students of a college and their fathers celebrate, on the same day, some national jubilee, and it will probably be found that the juniors have perpetrated more puns, and exhibited more boisterous hilarity, while the seniors have made deeper potations and raised louder hurrahs. Though young men are very apt to indulge to excess in their social gatherings, still they are but imitators, and often carry their cups more discreetly than their sires.

The evils incident to college life are many of them the growth of ages. Some of them are local, arising from the relation of the students to the citizens of the town or city where the college is situated. Others spring from the very structure of the buildings they occupy. Our college edifices were, unfortunately, built after a bad model. Our fathers regarded the English University as the perfect type of what a college ought to be. The English Universities were offshoots from the monasteries and conventual schools of the Middle Ages. They were essentially monastic in all their features. Students, like monks, were secluded in cloisters. This surely was not the most favorable condition for cultivating manners and morals. A cenobite is usually careless of his dress and person, indifferent to cleanliness and decency. A monk, a recluse, a solitary, has no motive to cultivate the "small, sweet courtesies of life." They are never called for in his solitary cell. So the student, shut out from the world, with none of the gentle influences of home around him, forms habits of self-indulgence and indolence. His room is neglected. The dust settles in undisturbed repose on his furniture, the spider spins her web unmolested, his carpet is saturated with mud, and the walls of his room with tobacco-smoke. This is by no means true of all; but it is generally true that students are bad tenants. They are indifferent to the preservation of public property, and are exceedingly apt to mar its beauty without compunction. Buildings for students' dormitories are the very worst species of property a corporation can own. Though a reasonable rent is charged, it is chiefly expended in repairs and insurance. The buildings are also exceeding difficult of supervision. No proctor or tutor can conveniently inspect their long halls in the dark; if one were to attempt it, it might be

at the expense of personal violence or insult. Their doors, like those of Pluto's realm, are open night and day.

"At midnight, when mankind is wrapt in sleep,"

young conspirators resort to the room of some wily confederate, where their disguises are concealed, and prepare themselves to commit depredations upon public or private property, to smash windows, to rob gardens or barns, or, what is still more fashionable, to execute a midnight serenade with fish-horns. Thus the public buildings become the place of rendezvous for idle and disorderly students. Here mischief is plotted and vicious combinations matured.

Viewed in this light, public buildings are public nuisances; and if they were all demolished to-day, college morals and liberal learning would be gainers. How much better would it be for our infant institutions at the West, if, instead of burdening themselves with heavy debts in the erection of buildings for students, thus rendering their corporations bankrupt, they would rear a single edifice for public rooms, and open it for instruction, leaving the pupils to find lodgings and board in private houses! Thus every respectable householder would become a guardian of the peace of the college, and essentially aid the faculty in the administration of its laws. His house, of course, is closed at a seasonable hour at night. Young rioters could not assemble there at midnight without his knowledge. By such a distribution of the students throughout the village, a community of interests would be created between the citizens and the college, and feuds and quarrels prevented. Where the monastic system exists, students and townsmen are generally hostile to each other. To this day in Oxford the old cry of "Gown and town" is often heard in the streets, and disgraceful brawls are the common result. American cities, where colleges are located, are not strangers to such conflicts. The University of Paris has never provided lodgings for students. They have always been their own purveyors, and the peace and good order of the city has been promoted by the practice. The Queen's Commissioners have raised the question whether the number of undergraduates in the English Universities might not be greatly increased by

allowing them to live in private lodgings; and many of the heads of the colleges cordially approve of the plan. Others give ample testimony to the correct deportment of those who are now permitted to choose private rooms instead of college cloisters. So far as New England is concerned, the policy of erecting dormitories for students has long been approved by public opinion. We must, therefore, patiently bear the ills we cannot remedy, and show ourselves very grateful that we are not cursed with the inveterate vices of the Old World.

Our Colleges are still young and vigorous. They are happily adapted to the wants of a great and growing people. They do not indeed possess the apparatus, libraries, and accumulated lore of past ages essential to the highest attainments in science and the most profound scholarship; still, they form able reasoners, acute logicians, and sound thinkers. What they profess to do they do well. Their officers are laboring faithfully and assiduously to promote liberal learning, to inculcate sound morality, and to prepare their pupils thoroughly for the right discharge of all the duties of citizens. No literary institutions on the globe are doing so much as they for the education of the common mind,—for the diffusion of intelligence among the people. They owe their existence to the liberality of the active, business men of the community. By them they are chiefly patronized.

Our country is so rapidly increasing, that educated men easily find employment. There is a great and increasing demand for talent and skill. The true policy, therefore, of the nation is intellectual culture. In the words of New England's most eloquent living orator, they should engage, at once, "in the skill-business." But it must be remembered that schools and colleges cannot teach trades and handicrafts. In the present *furor* of the people for practical pursuits, there is danger of requiring too much of our literary institutions. They are already overtaken. The studies are too numerous for the time that can reasonably be devoted to them. The progressive sciences which belong properly to the scientific school have encroached largely upon those permanent studies which have been regarded by wise men, for a thousand years, as the best possible discipline for young minds; and yet the question

is debated gravely and earnestly by teachers' associations, "whether our Colleges are sufficiently *progressive* to meet the wants of the age." The more appropriate question for them to discuss is, whether our academies furnish an adequate preparation for the higher pursuits of the college. The imperfect and superficial preparation of students at the high schools and academies now cripples our Colleges and greatly abridges their usefulness. Nearly the whole of the Freshman year must be spent in drilling students upon those elementary portions of the languages and mathematics, which ought to have been thoroughly mastered at the preparatory school. Let the standard be elevated here; then our Colleges will become progressive in the highest sense of that term. As men make haste to be rich, so they make haste to be learned. They are impatient to be in the field of enterprise. They cannot stay to be thoroughly educated. They expect too much from a collegiate course. They imagine that the perceptive and physical powers will be as thoroughly trained as the intellectual; that the eye and ear will be taught to observe and hear; that the hand will acquire dexterity; that the full-fledged machinist or geologist will be matured in college halls. But science can be applied successfully to the arts only on the ground where they are practised. The navigator in his ship, the chemist in his laboratory, the machinist in his shop, the geologist, mineralogist, and engineer in the field, become adepts in their respective vocations, and nowhere else. It is the proper business of a college to discipline the minds of students, to make them vigorous and strong, to give them mental capital for scientific exploration, discovery, and invention, and for the duties of professional life, to teach the young man how to think rather than what to think, to make his mind a living spring, always flowing with thought, rather than a reservoir for other men's thoughts. To this service our Colleges are devoted, and they are doing their work successfully and faithfully.

We close these somewhat desultory remarks by a quotation from Charles Dickens. "Whatever the defects of American Universities may be, they disseminate no prejudices, rear no bigots, dig up the buried ashes of no old superstitions, never interpose between the people and their improvements,

exclude no man because of his religious opinions; above all, in their whole course of study and instruction, recognize a world, and a broad one too, lying beyond the college walls."

ART. VIII.—*Captain Canot, or Twenty Years of an African Slaver; being an Account of his Career and Adventures on the Coast, in the Interior, on Shipboard, and in the West Indies.* Written out and edited from the Captain's Journals, Memoranda, and Conversations. By BRANTZ MAYER. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1854. 12mo. pp. 448.

WHY have the Africans alone, of all nations and races, been doomed to continuous and enduring slavery? Members of other savage tribes have been enslaved, but the Africans alone have continued slaves. Others have shaken off the yoke, or perished under it; they alone have borne it as a permanent institution. Slavery has been their badge, their heritage, which they have handed down from generation to generation. To others it has been an accident; to them it has been a trait of character, a feature of their history. The Spaniards made slaves of the aborigines of South America and the West Indies; but no Indian slaves in those countries continue to this day. Our Puritan forefathers, not knowing what they did, shipped to Barbadoes, as slaves, a few of the captives whom they made in their Indian wars; but death, if not voluntary emancipation, soon freed them. Other barbarous races, however persecuted, banished, or cut down by the sword or the diseases of whites, have yet wholly escaped this ignominious doom,—have never been made beasts of burden to their conquerors. No one has thought of enslaving the Sandwich Islanders, the Tahitians, the Australians, or the Esquimaux. But the Africans have been slaves from time immemorial. The ancient Egyptians, as appears from their hieroglyphics and paintings, made goods and chattels of them; and the modern Egyptians and the Turks have done the same. Judging from history alone, we might as soon expect the leopard to change his skin,